RESTORATION *Review*

A Quarterly Journal of Philosophy of Restoration

Dedicated to the Task of Defining the Restoration of Primitive Christianity as the Spiritual, Moral and Intellectual Ideal of Modern Man

LEROY GARRETT, *Editor*

CLINT EVANS, *Publisher*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial	*Page*
Peter Learns a Lesson—Can We?	1
What Is Christian Journalism?	5
Eichman's Two Judgments	7
As Others See Us	8
How Men Use the Bible to Justify Their Divisions	*By the Editor*
The Search for the Good Man—Part II	10
The Good Man in Ancient Greek Thought, *By the Editor*	20

Published in January, April, July, and October by Restoration Press, 1916 Western Dr., Alton, Illinois.

Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; single copies 50c each.

Entered as second class matter at post office at Alton, Illinois.

Mailing Address: RESTORATION *Review*
1916 Western Drive
Alton, Illinois

Editorial...

LEROY GARRETT, Editor

PETER LEARNS A LESSON—CAN WE?

It was hard for Peter to learn his lesson. It not only took repetition, that trusted device of every good teacher, to teach Peter his lesson, but it took reminders and miracles as well. Perhaps there were psychological reasons as well as religious that account for the apostle's slowness to learn. We are told that men seldom learn anything that they do not want to learn. It was Thorndike, the psychologist, that talked about *the readiness to learn* as the first rule of learning. That is what Peter lacked: *readiness.* It could be true of some of us too.

Peter was a loyal, orthodox Jew, first, last and always. There were some things that a loyal, orthodox Jew simply did not do, and one of those things was to have any fraternization with a Gentile. From the day the fisherman became an apostle there is no reason to believe that he ever envisaged anything respecting the Messiah's work that was not Jewish-centered, if not exclusively Jewish. At various times in his instructions to his apostles the Master made it clear that his mission reached beyond Judaism, and he finally in the Great Commission included every creature in every nation in the apostles' preaching itinerary.

Peter failed to catch the force of all this. Had it been left up to him the gospel would have remained with the Jews. But the Spirit had glorious things in view for dear Peter, and he was willing to jar the apostle with a series of soul-searching miracles in order to get the point across. The first came while Peter was sleeping on the housetop while visiting with Simon the tanner. The circumstance was right for the Spirit to begin his instruction, for Peter was showing some compromise with his austerity by accepting hospitality from a tanner, one who worked with the dead bodies of animals and who would therefore be permanently unclean.

There is good psychology here, and it does no harm to suppose that the Spirit certainly knows how to take advantage of the psychology of a situation. Psychologists tell us that if we want to motivate a certain type of behavior we should begin by rewarding (they call it *reinforcing*) those actions that most approximate the behavior we want, even if it may fall short of our

expectation. For Peter to go so far as to enter the home of a tanner, even if a Jew, was certainly a propitious time to attempt to lead him ever further. Peter was dreaming, and there is more psychology there, but we will not get into that except to say that perhaps at last what Jesus had attempted to teach him was at least at play in his unconscious mind.

In the dream of the sheet coming down out of heaven God was reminding Peter that the gospel makes all men clean alike, and that in Christ there is no longer Jew and Gentile. It was so difficult for Peter to call *clean* what he had always regarded as *unclean.* Racial prejudice goes deep. One would have thought this magnificent vision and the experience that followed at the home of Cornelius would have been sufficient to convince Peter once for all that God has received the Gentiles too. After all, Peter uttered those striking words: "Truly I perceive that God shows no partiality, but in every nation anyone who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him." (Acts 10:34) But still Peter had not learned his lesson, not well enough at least.

Two fears always haunted Peter: the fear of breaking with long established tradition, exemplified by his slowness to accept the Gentiles; and the fear of running counter to party loyalties, which is reflected in his conduct in Antioch. Gal. 2:11-14 records the story of how Paul opposed Peter's conduct of first associating with Gentiles, and then withdrawing "when certain men came from James." Paul makes it clear that Peter was motivated by fear: "he drew back and separated himself, *fearing the circumcision party.*"

Even if we concede that Peter deserved the rebuke handed him by Paul, we cannot help but feel pity for him. Fear is a painful experience, and we must realize that we are all often motivated by fear. We need the assurance given us by the Lord: "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." (Lk. 12:32) There is also much thought in 1 John 4:18: "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casts out fear. For fear has to do with punishment, and he who fears is not perfected in love."

Can we not see ourselves in Peter? The simple truth is that Peter did not love enough, and thus fell prey to fear. Fear got in the apostle's way, keeping him from learning the great lesson of brotherhood. Fear of the party has kept men from accepting the Christ: "Nevertheless many even of the authorities believed in him, but for fear of the Pharisees they did not confess it, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." (John 12:42-43) And it was fear that kept Peter from treating his Gentile brothers as brothers should be treated.

Fear of the party haunts many men who down deep in their hearts want to be as liberal as the gospel itself. Many preachers and elders even in the South would be glad to welcome Negroes to their congregations, but they dare not express such opinions. Christian colleges continue to hold back, hesitant to enroll the first Negro, waiting for the public schools to set the pace. Yes, even in the twentieth century, two thousand years after Peter, we Christians have institutions that we call *Christian* colleges from which men

are barred because of the color of their skin, irrespective of how deserving they may be otherwise or how much they may need the education. So we need not be too hard on Peter.

Fear of the party causes men to act little when they really want to be big. No decent man wants to withhold the usual expression of Christian courtesy from a visiting minister, one that he may even honor as a dear friend, but partyism demands it if the brother happens to be from the Christian Church or holds an unorthodox millennial view. A party-man in the Church of Christ, for instance, would have a hard time saying something like this: "In our audience tonight we have brother John Andrews, minister of the First Christian Church and one of our most respected citizens. We shall ask him to lead our minds in a prayer to the heavenly Father."

It is my conviction that *many* of our leaders would like to be this free, but they dare not because of the party. There is one thing that partyism cannot tolerate, and that is a non-party man. And yet there is a strange contradiction in all this: take me individually or in small groups and they will reject such party practices and insist that things should change. And yet when those men are with party leaders, as was Peter at Antioch when he showed this inconsistency, they fall in line, toeing the line of tradition once more.

Even the party leaders will sometimes think out loud and say more than they intend. We get reports of how professors in the colleges will downgrade the traditional position on instrumental music or perhaps suggest that Christian Church folk and Baptists should be "fellowshipped"—and then quickly add: "Now this is between you and me." One interesting report went something like this: "Well, yes, Carl Ketcherside is basically right in what he is saying about fellowship and unity, but you can't go around saying that." The reason being: *the Church of Christ party will not tolerate it.*

Men are basically good; they want to act and think benevolently. The human mind longs to stretch; it wants to be liberal. Partyism stifles intellectual growth and starves man's thirst for creative brotherhood. The growing Christian mind will be as contented in the presence of a pious Presbyterian or a dedicated Episcopalian as he would be with those who agree with him more. Little minds are uncomfortable in the presence of big minds. The party mind seeks its own level—other party minds—and it revels in depreciating all others. Partyism encourages mediocrity and resents excellence. It brands as heretics all who break its ranks; it castigates as hobbyists all who oppose its own practices.

Peter had to get one point straight, and that is the thing we must all get straight: *will I be a party-man and gain the praise of men or will I seek the truth at all cost and gain the praise of God.* So long as Peter feared the party his conduct would be predictable: he would follow the party line. It is also predictable what will happen when one declares himself free of the party: the party will apply the pressures at its disposal, including financial reprisal and alienation.

We want to believe that Peter finally learned his lesson in brotherhood. Paul's sharp rebuke at Antioch should have done it. He at least talked like a convinced man at the Jerusualem conference in Acts 15:7-9: "Brethren, you know that in the early days God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe. And God who knows the heart bore witness to them, giving them the Holy Spirit just as he did to us; and he made no distinction between us and them, but cleansed their hearts by faith.'

One thing is certain: if Peter finally received the Gentiles as his brothers in the Lord without reservation it is because he overcame the fear of his party. So it is with us: if we *really* believe that whites and Negros are equal in God's sight, and if we are as happy to sit with them at the Lord's table as any white brother, it is because the love of God has come to mean more to us than "Southern tradition." And if we receive a man as our brother, and treat him as a brother, even if there be doctrinal differences (and there always are!), it is because the Holy Spirit has shed abroad that love in our hearts that overshadows party loyalty.

In quotation above from Peter in Acts 15 the phrase "God who knows the heart" we have the reference that will dispel partyism. *God knows the heart!* The man who seeks to rise above sectarian bigotry has a difficult task. He may have to sacrifice professional standing and financial security. He may well become *a fool of God.* He most certainly will be misunderstood and looked upon as an enemy by those who would otherwise exalt him. It is a lesson that a man can learn only when he has his values straight—the praise of God is the one thing he wills. The great over-riding principle in it all is that *God knows the heart.* "The Lord sees not as man sees; man looks on the outward appearance, but the Lord looks on the heart." (1 Sam. 16:7) And the God who knows how to bless!

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN JOURNALISM?

An industrious young man at one of the Christian colleges has completed an interesting survey on "A Study of the Ethics of Christian Journalism." I have not yet read his full report, but he has sent me a chart that reveals the summary of his findings. This journal was one of the 83 publications that were polled in regards to ethical standards, along with my reply I requested a report of the findings. I also asked the student in what sense he was using the term "Christian Journalism." I wanted to know if he meant only *Church of Christ* journalism, which I suspected, knowing something about the parochial environment in which he was studying.

He wrote back that he did indeed mean those publications connected with the Churches of Christ, for he considers all Christians to be members of the Church of Christ. He was kind enough to offer his apologies, for he did not intend to offend me, but supposed that I identified myself with the Church

of Christ. My reply to him is given below, which may be of some interest to our readers.

This fine young Texan has given me permission to pass along some of his findings, which appear to me to be both significant and revealing, confirming what I have long suspected from my rather extensive experience with the very ones polled by the brother.

38 per cent said that inaccuracy in publication is not at all serious or only slightly serious.

42 per cent said that plagiarism is either not at all serious (32 per cent) or only slightly serious (10 per cent). This finding shocked even me! Plagiarism is stealing.

30 per cent said that "when convinced of an error failure to admit and correct it" is either not at all serious (25 per cent) or slightly serious (25 per cent).

31 per cent (nearly one-third of those who replied) said that it is not at all serious to publish someone's name with the deliberate intent of harming him.

61 per cent said it is not at all serious or only slightly serious to state one view and exclude all others. This point needs clarification, for it quite obviously depends upon the nature of the material presented. If it is a controversial issue among the brethren, it is one thing; if it is as essay on the nature of man, it is another. Anyway, 50 per cent stated that this is most prevalent or moderately prevalent in Church of Christ papers.

29 per cent said it is not serious at all to make a personal attack upon a brother without fair investigation. Is not this amazing?

44 per cent (upward of half the editors, mind you) said that the "publication of evil reports, though while true, will not serve any purpose by their publication," is either not serious at all (34 per cent) or only slightly serious (10 per cent).

40 per cent said it is not at all serious to stir up controversy to increase circulation. Only 48 per cent considered it most serious."

Now the letter:

> Thank you very kindly for your letter and for the chart on your findings on journalistic ethics among our brethren.
>
> If I understand your chart, it seems that you might have to get beyond what you call "Christian journalism" to find much moral sensitivity. Were you not stunned to find such substantial percentages falling into your "not serious" and "slightly serious" categories on some of your vital criteria of ethics?
>
> You have 44% who say it is not serious or only slightly serious to stir up controversy in order to increase circulation. You have over one-third who say plagiarism is not serious—upward of half the editors say it is either not serious or only slightly serious! You have 29% willing to attack others without fair investigation!
>
> Thank you also for answering my question as to what you meant by "Christian journalism." I should think that your view that "Christian journalism"

is limited to what we call the Church of Christ publications is a most parochial concept. I am glad to notice that you refer to those who use instrumental music as your brethren, and yet I take it that you do not think of them as members of the Church of Christ. If they are your brethren, then they are Christians, and their publications might well be "Christian journalism" also, might they not?

Take such fine, spiritual, high-level publications as *Eternity*, *His*, and *Christianity Today*. These you would not think of as Christian publications, I take it, while the *Gospel Guardian* and *Firm Foundation* are Christian journals. May I conclude that *Eternity* would become a Christian journal if B. C. Goodpasture should become its editor, thus bringing it within the orbit of what we call the Church of Christ?

I am not so sure but what this provincial view of yours would exclude the journals of our pioneers in whose veins flowed printer's ink. Had he been living today you would hardly have included Alexander Campbell and his *Christian Baptist* in your survey of Christian editors, for he was still a Baptist back in those days. I suppose your view means that in all the history of modern literature and publication there is no Christian journalism to be found before the birth of the *Gospel Advocate* and the *American Christian Review*, for these were the first honest-to-goodness "Church of Christ" publications.

Your equation of "Christian journalism" with Church of Christ publications reminds me of the book currently being published by the *Firm Foundation* entitled "History of the Church in Texas," which of course means "History of the Church of Christ in Texas." Now, my dear brother, must we be so parochial as to suppose that a history of *the church in Texas* should be a history of the Church of Christ only. The book should be entitled according to what it is: the history of one particular church within Christendom, which is of course a most legitimate historical subject. But this business of equating the Church of Christ with *the church* is both offensive and arrogant. And so with your thesis: thinking people will wonder how a student in a liberal arts college could come to the place that he would think of "Christian journalism" as limited to the publications of his own religious party. This is why I thought you would do better to call your thesis "A Study of the Ethics of Church of Christ Journalism," or some such limitation.

Thinking people might also wonder about the intellectual integrity of an educational institution that would permit such parochial thinking. I venture to say you will not find such parochialism even in Roman Catholic circles.

You certainly did not offend me in suggesting that I identify myself with the Church of Christ. It is simply that I do not seek alliance with any party within Christendom, whether it be the Christian Church, Church of Christ or any other. I wish to be a disciple at large. I do not belong to any party or its sub-parties. I seek to belong only to the Christ. Why cannot I belong only to Him, which will make me a member of his Body, the Catholic church of God on earth, and to no party at all? Certainly the Church of Christ people are my brethren, but they are not the only brethren I have, for all those who believe in the Christ and submit to his Lordship are my brethren.

I would define "Christian journalism" as all publication efforts that endeavor to honor the Christ, interpret his word, unite and edify the children of God. This means that I might be reluctant to call some journals "Christian" that you do, for they are but organs of partyism, while there are many others that I would think of as "Christian" that you would not so classify, for they are Christian in both their purpose and their ethics. It is probable that the Christian character of a journal is a relative thing, for sometimes it will be more Christian than at other times, just as in the case of an individual. But a journal that is dedicated to the glory of God and the Christ should certainly be thought of as Christian, even though it may sometimes err in its efforts. A publication dedicated to the task of protecting and preserving the interests of the party spirit or economic interests can hardly be Christian in any real sense, but in pretense only.

EICHMANN'S TWO JUDGMENTS

One cannot help but be impressed with William Hull's account in *Eternity Magazine* of his struggle for the soul of Eichmann. The missionary, with whom Eichmann agreed to study the Bible, gives an extended account of this experience in his forthcoming book, "The Struggle for a Soul." In the magazine story he relates some of the interesting interviews that he had with the condemned man.

Mr. Hull is to be appreciated for his effort to let God speak to Eichmann in the words of the Bible itself. The missionary said little or nothing by way of interpretation, but simply had the prisoner turn to the various verses and read for himself in a German Bible. He says of his visits: "To begin with it was a duty mission rather than a visit of compassion and mercy, but as time went on I struggled against a God-given feeling of pity and affection for the soul of Adolf Eichmann." There were 13 visits in all extending over a period of 50 days.

The most impressive feature of Hull's effort is the way he started. Even though Eichmann revealed no sense of guilt at all, even saying "I know God; I have never lost touch with God," the missionary proceeded to have him read concerning *the judgment of God.* "I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear Him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear Him. (Lk. 12:4-5). The missionary's wife read the German aloud while Eichmann followed in the Bible they had given him. From there on it was Bible, Bible, Bible. When Eichmann rebelled against some verses that spoke of hell, insisting "I do not believe in hell," Mr. Hull would not argue, but would simply have Eichmann turn to other passages, such as "For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." (Ecc. 12:14)

It must have been a sobering experience for Eichmann when Mr. Hull pointed out that Eichmann had thus far been judged only by men's judgment. He had passed through a long trial. He had been condemned to die by a human court. But to kill a body is all that man can do. Eichmann has yet another trial to face—*the judgment of God!* Mr. Hull's initial lesson on the two judgments was most appropriate.

The missionary gives no indication that the prisoner was touched with the precious words of truth. But it is gratifying to know that a serious effort was made to reach him in his last days upon earth. Mr. Hull humbly acknowledged that someone else might have done a better job than he and his wife did, or that a different approach might have been more effective. The important thing is that Eichmann was confronted with the Christ in the pages of Holy Writ itself.

What is true of Eichmann is true of us all. We too have two judgments to face, and it may well be true that we are often more concerned with what man thinks than what God thinks. The praise of men has always been most

enticing. God is our loving heavenly Father, but he is also Judge of us all. Woe be unto us if we are more sensitive about the judgment of men than of God. On that "fixed day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed" it will matter little what men have said. The plaudits of the crowd will mean nothing. Our big budgets, real estate holdings, large crowds, programs, and all the rest—including degrees and honors and being a big man in the brotherhood—will be quite beside the point. Each man will stand before the Christ on his own, right along with Eichmann, and it is *that* judgment that matters—and oh how it does matter! May God be with us all.

AS OTHERS SEE US

By means of a "Letter from America," written by an Episcopal priest in Nashville to his friend in England, we get a candid view of what others think of us who compose the Church of Christ—Christian Church brotherhood. The rector is apparently an Englishman, or recently from England, and he writes these letters back home telling about all aspects of American life, secular as well as religious. In *Letter No.* 3 he tells of the excitement over the Cuban crisis in his own parish, of how the flock was gathered for prayer, and he mentions that the experience gave Americans a new appreciation of the British, who have lived in such crises for generations, referring to having enemy guns so near their own shore.

He also talks about the weather, prosperity, United Fund, Credit Union, politics, and the Hermitage. He also has a word to say about the Church of Christ and Christian Church, providing us with a rare insight as to what some highly respected churchmen really think of us. Speaking of "such sects unknown to us in England as 'The Christian Church' and 'The Church of Christ'", he says:

> For believe it or not there are actually splinter groups in the American religious scent who have the effrontery to arrogate such titles exclusively to themselves. I had always regarded myself as both a Christian and a member, however unworthy and fallible, of the Church of Christ. I had to come to America to learn that you could be one without being the other, and that we who (mistakenly it seems) had been bold enough to think ourselves as both Christians and members of Christ's Church were in fact neither.

He then says the following good word:

> But having shot my bolt, and feeling the better for it, let me hasten to give praise where praise is due. These people have deep convictions, and are prepared to pay for them. Their churches are fine modern buildings, beautifully maintained. The social work which I shall instance, as the judge described it, costs time and money . . .

He goes on to tell how these churches help their delinquent youth.

No good, intelligent man, as this Anglican obviously is, can criticize us for believing that we are right. But he has the right to resent our strongly implied claim that we are the *only* ones that are right—*that we indeed are right and everybody else is wrong!*

There is a big difference between being *Christian only* and being *the only Christians.* A large part of our brethren in the Christian Church (the Disciples) have overcome exclusivism, recognizing that they are another denomination in the church at large, or at least as a movement for unity and restoration within divided Christendom. But the conservative wing of the Christian Church is every whit as bad as the various groups called Church of Christ in their claims for priority.

The one glorious exception in the Church of Christ wing of discipledom is the group known as "the premillennial churches," which probably number about 150 congregations. They do not believe they are right and everybody else is wrong. Even on the matter of millennial interpretations, they do not make their own belief any kind of "test of fellowship." Regardless of one's view on when or how the Lord comes, these brethren not only welcome him, but encourage him to share their program. They make no distinctions among brethren. They are to be commended for this. Neither do they believe that all the Christians are cornered off in what we call the Church of Christ.

Any of us could recall numerous instances where this arrogance on our part is resented. Must we believe that a man cannot be a Christian because he happens to be an Episcopalian or a Methodist? Has it ever dawned on us that they just might possibly be better Christians than we are? Arrogance is not a lovely virtue—and anybody who thinks he's right and everybody else wrong *is* arrogant! Let us keep in mind the prayer of the publican: "God, be merciful to me a sinner!" Jesus liked that man better than the Pharisee who was so blooming right about everything.

With this number of *Restoration Review* we begin our fifth year of publication, the eleventh year since *Bible Talk.* Following this fifth volume *Restoration Review* will be published on monthly basis, but the subscription price will remain the same. We urge you to renew your subscription at once.

The next two numbers will feature some outstanding essays on unity and fellowship by Carl Ketcherside, lengthy treatments of *Agape*: *The Basis of Christian Fellowship* and *The Grounds for Christian Unity.*

Tell your friends about *Restoration Review.* Send your renewal today! Include the names of four of your friends, all for only $5. *Restoration Review,* 1916 Western Dr., Alton, Illinois.

HOW MEN USE THE BIBLE TO JUSTIFY THEIR DIVISIONS

There are a few passages of scripture that are referred to with great frequency by some of our brethren as an excuse for alienation. These passages are made to mean either that division within the body of Christ is sometimes right (and of course each faction among us is convinced that its own separate existence is justifiable) or that it is proper to reject some brethren on the ground of doctrinal error.

We question whether it is ever right for Christians to divide. A group of saints may be correct in their interpretation of the scriptures, and they may be right in their opposition to what they consider to be a serious doctrinal error, and yet have no scriptural right to alienate themselves from the others and start another congregation. We likewise question the practice of rejecting any brother on the basis of his misunderstanding of scripture. There are surely grounds for excluding a brother from the fellowship of the congregation, but a sincere and well-meaning misinterpretation of the Bible is not among them. Whether a brother is *right* or *wrong* in this or that interpretation of scripture is beside the point of whether I receive him as a brother beloved.

And yet the Bible itself is used to defend both of the practices. Our brethren divide and sub-divide; we sometimes have as many as six or eight different groups of disciples in one town, each of which struggles against the others for its existence, and each considering itself *the loyal church,* pointing to the Bible, of course, as justification for its existence. We go on rejecting each other on the basis that we do not see things alike, insisting that oneness of opinion is essential to fellowship, and the Bible is suppose to sustain such a viewpoint.

If unity is to be enjoyed by these various factions, these obstructions must be removed. We propose to show that these passages do not teach what is claimed for them, but that they are rather in each instance part of the scriptural plea for the unity of the saints.

Romans 16:17: *"I appeal to you, brethren, to take note of those who create dissensions and difficulties, in opposition to the doctrine which you have been taught; avoid them."*

This passage warns against those whose purpose it is to wreck a church for their own selfish ends. One who tries to disturb the peace of the brethren has a lot to answer for. The next verse further describes him: "Such persons do not serve our Lord Christ, but their own appetites, and by fair and flattering words they deceive the hearts of the simple-minded." He is a deceiver who pretends to have the church's good at heart, but who really wishes to wreck it. William Barclay in *Daily Bible Study on Romans* describes such a man: "There are people who take pride in making trouble, and who like nothing better than to sow the poisonous seeds of dissension and to await the coming strife.

The man who is a disturber of the peace, the man who has brought strife to any band of brothers will answer for it some day to Him who is the King and Head of the Church."

The Christian is a peacemaker and he seeks for those things which make for peace. He will not create schisms within the body of Christ, and he will not permit others to use him for such a purpose. The man whose heart is set on peace will not be the cause of a split in the church. He will remove himself from the scene before he lets such happen.

Romans 16:17 is clearly an injunction against those who are schismatic. Paul probably was referring especially to the Judaizers who sought to destroy all Christian work that did not conform to their own brand of orthodoxy. The Roman saints were to keep their eye on such men and see to it that they did not pull any of their schismatic tricks. Men who have wicked deeds to peddle are to be avoided. They were to have nothing to do with such men.

Now that we have an understanding of what this interesting passage means, let us see how it is so often interpreted to the havoc of Christian oneness.

1. The most serious abuse of this passage is the view that it is all right to cause dissensions and divisions so long as it is done in keeping with "the doctrine which you have been taught." There are those who cause divisions over false doctrine or their own opinions or over things that do not matter, and this is wrong. But if one causes division by standing for the truth, this is all right. So they make the passage read this way: "Mark them which cause divisions and offences that are contrary to the doctrine which you have learned." In other words the division is warranted if it is caused by standing for the truth, each one of course deciding just what determines truth.

Much was made of this interpretation in a recent conversation I had with brethren who are associated with the anti-Herald of Truth segment of our brotherhood. They were complaining that the "liberal" brethren were quoting Romans 16:17 against them, but that they would only use the first part of the verse, "Mark them which cause divisions and offences," leaving out *contrary to the doctrine which you learned.* These brethren admitted that they were causing division, or at least division was the result of their labors, but that such is right and proper so long as its purpose is to preserve the doctrinal purity of the church.

I cannot believe that Paul is saying that division and dissension are all right if they are the result of being loyal to doctrine. The man who says, "I'll wreck this church for the sake of truth," cannot look to Romans 16:17 for his defense. This is a misunderstanding of the phrase "contrary to the doctrine which you learned."

Paul is simply saying that the spirit that causes divisions and dissension is contrary to the teaching that I have been giving you. He does not mean that some division is caused by error and some by truth, and that division is all right if it is necessary to preserve truth. If this were the case, doctrinal problems would be solved by the disputants going out and starting churches of their own, which is the very practice that must stop.

MacKnight's rendition of Romans 16:17 is helpful: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them who set up separate assemblies for worship, and who occasion the weak to fall by false doctrine, or by enjoining things indifferent as necessary, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned from me in this epistle, and avoid them." Barnes likewise understands "contrary to the doctrine" to refer to "the teaching which you have received in this epistle and elsewhere, the teaching that these divisions should cease."

When men make peace their prime object they will not think in terms of division. This is the plea in Romans, especially the latter chapters. Notice the emphasis that Paul gives this.

"Let love be genuine." (12:9)

"Owe no one anything, except to love one another." (13:8)

"As for the man who is weak in faith, welcome him, but not for disputes over opinions." (14:1)

"Then let us no more pass judgment on one another, but rather decide never to put a stumbling-block or hindrance in the way of a brother." (14-13)

"Let us then pursue what makes for peace and for mutual upbuilding." (14:19)

"Do not, for the sake of food, destroy the work of God." (14:20)

"We who are strong ought to bear with the failings of the weak, and not to please ourselves; let each of us please his neighbor for his good, to edify him." (15:1-2)

"Welcome one another, therefore, as Christ has welcomed you." (15:7)

People who have this spirit, who are motivated by *this doctrine,* will not think in terms of alienation and separation as means of preserving what they believe to be true interpretations of scripture. If men truly seek peace and mutual upbuilding, if they truly love each other and welcome each other as Christ welcomes us, then they will not draw lines on each other over doctrinal differences.

Men who put their own interests first, and who are willing to divide a church in order to carry their point are the ones to be marked, for they serve not Christ but their own appetites. Such a divisive spirit is contrary to the teaching Paul gave the Romans.

2. Another misuse of Romans 16:17 is to apply it indiscriminately to all controversial men and issues. If strong teaching, or perhaps something that sounds unorthodox, is presented to a congregation, there are those who will cry, "Romans 16:17", as if to suggest that anything that is the slightest variation may cause division. Some congregations need to be shocked and disturbed; some need to be strongly rebuked for their sins. One who thus "reproves, rebukes, and exhorts with longsuffering and teaching" may have no intention at all of causing dissension, and it would be unfair to level such a charge against him. The man Paul speaks of in Romans 16:17 is one who is malicious and vicious in his intentions to harm the congregation.

A more serious feature of this kind of misuse of Romans 16:17 is the connection that is made with fellowship. There is no indication in the passage

that the apostle was instructing the Romans to excommunicate such men. To "mark" means they were to watch out for them, to be on their guard against such; "avoid them" means they were not to follow them as teachers. Since this had reference to outsiders that were coming into the congregation, it is unlikely that the question of fellowship enters at all. The passage is therefore unrelated to the question of fellowship. It is a gross abuse to use this passage in such a way as to make it teach that we are not to have fellowship with anyone that would teach doctrines contrary to what we believe to be the truth.

2 John 9:11: *"Any one who goes ahead and does not abide in the doctrine of Christ does not have God; he who abides in the doctrine of Christ has both the Father and the Son. If any one comes to you and does not bring this doctrine, do not receive him into the house or give him any greeting; for he who greets him shares his wicked work."*

No passage is used more than this one by some of our people to promote and sustain sectarianism. It is often appealed to as a justification for bitter and arbitary line-drawing that keps brethren separated into cliques. Typical is the use made of this passage in *Gospel Advocate* (Jan. 31, 1963):

> If I believe instrumental music in worship to be a sin, I cannot practice it, neither can I honor anyone else that does it. John (2 John 9-11) warns me that if I "bid godspeed" or give my blessing in a definite way to the preaching or teaching of a false doctrine, then I become guilty of such teaching myself.

The "doctrine of Christ" is here made to refer to any and all Christian truth. It is interpreted to mean that if any brother is in error on any point of doctrine, he is void of both the Father and the Son. One wonders how anyone could possibly believe such a thing, but I will assure you that the argument is often made in just such a way.

This means that we are asked to believe that John is saying that if a brother uses instrumental music (or departs upon any item of truth as we see it) he has neither God nor Christ, that his work is wicked, and that we are not to receive him into our home or give him any greeting. Can we really believe such?

If a brother is a premillennialist, then he has not God! I cannot even invite him into my home! I cannot even say "hello" to him, lest I partake of his evil deeds!

If a brother supports the Herald of Truth radio-TV program or if he believes in orphan homes or missionary societies, then he no longer "abides in the doctrine of Christ" and is therefore unfit for Christian association in our home! He has neither Christ nor God since he supports societies!

A doctrine that would cause one to be so unchristian and crude, as well as downright stupid, could not be scriptural. Surely brethren are not thinking when they make such arguments.

The context makes it clear as to whom John is referring: "For many deceivers have gone out into the world, men who will not acknowledge the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh; such a one is the deceiver and the anti-christ." (verse 7) In 1 John 2:22-23 he says much the same: "Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the anti-christ, he who denies

the Father and the Son." Then he adds: "No one who denies the Son has the Father. He who confesses the Son has the Father also."

Such is the burden of all three of John's letters. He is instructing against the wandering teachers called Gnostics who were a threat to the church in that they denied the reality of the incarnation of Jesus. These were the ones who denied the Father and the Son. This is "the doctrine" that one had to bring—*that Jesus had truly come in the flesh*—if he were to be received into the home and be given blessing. It was the anti-christ, therefore, who was evil and had neither the Father or the Son. It was the Gnostic teacher who denied the uniqueness of the Christ that was to be denied hospitality in the home.

It is farfetched indeed to make this apply to brethren who have divergent views on colleges, preachers, orphanages, TV programs, instrumental music, and millennial theories. The *doctrine* that John speaks of is that Jesus has come in the flesh, that he is indeed the Son of God. It is the man who denies this that is the anti-Christ; and this is the man that has neither God nor Christ. The Gnostic heretics who were seeking to foist this destructive teaching upon the saints are the ones that the Christians were not to invite into their homes.

It is a travesty against both the Bible and decency to apply this passage in 2 John to people generally who happen to interpret the scriptures differently from ourselves. It is hard for me to see that my brethren really believe that they cannot invite a man into their home if he happens to use an organ in worship or believes in supporting Herald of Truth. Yet in almost every issue of our brotherhood journals just such use is made of 2 John 9!

1 Cor. 1:10: *"I appeal to you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree and that there be no dissensions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and the same judgment."*

The passage is used to support the notion that all of us are to see everything alike if unity is to be realized. Agreement and division (or dissension) are placed against each other in such a way as to suggest that if there is agreement ("all speak the same thing") then there will not be division ("that there be no divisions among you"). But this is not true: you can have division that is unanimous and you can have unity that is divisive. A church can "speak the same thing" and still be divided; it can be united and yet not "speak the same thing."

But more to the point: it is not possible for any group of people to "speak the same thing" the way my brethren interpret this passage. Just as men do not look alike, so they do not think alike. No two men approach a problem the same way. As our fingerprints are all different, so our thought patterns are different. In 1 Cor. 1:10 the apostle is not even suggesting that it might be possible for all of us to see the Bible alike. There is no indication anywhere that God ever expected or required it of us. We can be thankful for that!

Yet this passage is used to uphold the idea that if any of us disagree on any point that we'd better hurry up and get together on it, for the Bible commands us to speak the same thing. No division and speaking the same thing go

together: if we're divided it is because we're not thinking and talking alike; if we are not thinking and speaking alike it is a sure thing that we are not united.

One wonders how much *thinking* people do who make such an interpretation, for it is apparent that no one in the Bible or out of it ever achieved such a thing. The church has never had unanimity of conviction on anything, much less everything. One might also wonder if this would be desirable even if possible.

What does 1 Cor. 1:10 mean then? As is usually the case, the passage becomes clear in the light of its context. The dissension at Corinth was around men. There were various cries: "I belong to Paul", "I belong to Cephas", "I belong to Apollos", "I belong to Christ." But there should be but *one* cry since there is but *one* Savior. Paul's appeal that they "all speak the same thing" was an appeal to loyalty to Christ as the only Lord. They were not to follow men, and it was an insult to the Christian's concept of the Lordship of Christ for a congregation to be divided by party cries. This is why Paul castigates them as he does in I Cor. 3, calling them "men of the flesh" because of the strife, jealousy, and party spirit, which found expression in such cries as, "I am of Cephas."

In telling them to be of "the same mind and the same judgment" and to "speak the same thing" he was insisting that their devotion and loyalty be only to Christ. This is made clear by Moffatt's rendition of this passage in his Commentary on First Corinthians: "Brothers, for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ I beg of you all to drop these party-cries. There must be no cliques among you; you must regain your common temper and attitude."

Moffatt observes that there are always in the church some who are too young to be wise, too generous to be cautious, too warm to be sober, or too intellectual to be humble. He says such persons will be very apt to attach themselves to particular persons, to use particular names, and to say things merely because others do, and thus act in a party-spirited way. This was the case.

Paul is not telling them that they have to see everything alike, nor is he suggesting that unity is dependent upon doctrinal agreement. When he says, as he does in 2 Cor. 13:11, "Mend your ways, heed my appeal, agree with one another, live in peace, and the God of love and peace will be with you," he is telling them to be Christ-minded instead of party-minded.

Barclay in his *Daily Bible Study on First Corinthians* suggests that verse 12 could read: "I am of Paul; I am of Apollos; I am of Cephas—but *I* belong to Christ," which may mean that the last group was more wretchedly sectarian than any. "If this does describe a party," says Barclay, "they must have been a small and rigid and self-righteous sect who claimed that they were the only true Christians in Corinth." Barclay adds: "Their real fault was not in saying that they belonged to Christ, but in acting as if Christ belonged to them. It may well describe a little, intolerant, self-righteous group."

In the light of the real meaning of 1 Cor. 1:10 we can appeal to the many dissident groups within discipledom that they too *stop these party* cries!

Let us all speak the same thing, that is, let us say we are all one in Christ together. Christ is not divided. He is our Lord, and our loyalty is to him rather

than to any group of men, and we belong to him rather than to any institution of men. Our devotion is to him, not to any party. This is the force of 1 Cor. 10, and it is wrong to make such a verse mean that all Christians must see everything alike and that they must say everything the same way.

Amos 3:3: *"Can two walk together, except they be agreed?"*

With amazing frequency many of our brethren use this passage to teach that if two men are in fellowship with each other they must be in doctrinal agreement. It is made to mean that men cannot have unity (that is, men cannot *walk together*) unless they believe alike. This makes the prophet Amos lay down a strange principle of brotherhood. You and I cannot enjoy Christian fellowship with each other unless we see eye to eye on everything! One wonders if any two people in the entire history of the human race could ever have walked together—including husbands and wives!

The prophet could have meant nothing so irrational. The truth is that many people walk together, loving, respecting, and enjoying one another, who are poles apart theologically. The prophet would simply be wrong if he affirmed such a proposition. If you see two men walking together the chances are that they are discussing their differences!

Some of the translations since the King James makes such an interpretation of Amos 3:3 impossible. The RSV for instance: "Do two walk together, unless they have made an appointment?" But even with the King James open before one the context will reveal that the prophet was making no reference to unity or fellowship whatever. He was rather justifying his role as a prophet, and this he was doing with a cause-effect argument sequence. A lion roars only when it has a prey (verse 4); the young lion cries out only when it has something (verse 4); a bird falls into a snare only because of the trap (verse 5); a snare springs up from the ground only when it has taken something (verse 5); the trumpet sounds and the people are afraid (verse 6); evil befalls a city because of the Lord's judgment (verse 6).

It is in this context that the prophet says, "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" It simply means that two men will not show up at the same place at the same time unless they have arranged it previously. So with all the other metaphors: the lion roars when it has a prey; the bird falls into a snare because of the trap—and so I am prophesying because the Lord has called me. Just as two men cannot walk together unless it were pre-arranged, so I cannot be speaking as a prophet if God had not called me. "God has spoken, how can I but prophesy."

This gross abuse of this passage illustrates the harm that can come by lifting passages from their context so as to make them mean what we want them to mean. It should cause us to question the "proof-text" method of handling the Bible. It is not true that one can prove anything from the Bible, unless he permits himself to abuse the Bible by taking verses from their context, and making them mean what they were never intended to mean. It reflects on one's intellectual honesty as well as his scholarship.

2 Thess. 3:6: *"Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received of us."*

This passage has been made a kind of "catch all" to be used on any brother who does not toe the orthodox line. This verse is often quoted in bulls of excommunication that are published in brotherhood journals. Some brother is "withdrawn from" for "walking disorderly"—and this is made to apply to most anything. There is little evidence that those who make such use of this passage ever took the trouble to read the context and discover what the apostle meant by "walking disorderly."

The language of the King James translators is in this instance most fortunate for our brotherhood practices. It give us every wide latitude to do with dissident brethren what we want to do. "Walking disorderly" can be made into the Mother Hubbard dress that covers everything but touches nothing. However peaceful and loving a brother may be in his attitude, he becomes guilty of "walking disorderly" when he violates the *status quo*. An interesting case in point is the lamented R. H. Boll, who for a half century was the strongest voice in the premillennial wing of the non-instrument brethren.

While brother Boll sincerely believed and taught premillennial concepts, he insisted that no view of the coming of Christ should be made a test of fellowship, and he never made his own views a test of loyalty. He was adamant in his conviction that churches should not divide and that brethren should not draw lines on each other. He was against any premillennial faction or amillennial party, but rather he felt that each brother should be allowed in a spirit of love and goodwill to interpret the scriptures as he sees them and let it go at that. But it did not turn out that way. Brother Boll was eventually forced to withdraw from the *Gospel Advocate* staff, and he was "withdrawn from" by the non-instrument brotherhood for "walking disorderly." Today there must be some 150 "premillennial congregations" within discipledom. In my association with them I have found them to be the most peace-loving and the most eager to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" of any of our groups. And yet they are completely shut off from the rest of the churches. While they desire the fellowship of all the saints of God, they are rejected on the grounds of being premillennial, which is one way of "walking disorderly."

What I have said about the banishment of the premillennialist by the "main-line" Church of Christ, can be said, more or less, of us all. Lines are drawn on cups, classes, open membership, colleges, congregational cooperation, orphanages, missionary societies, etc. The phenomenal thing about this is that in all these factions you have those who look upon all the others as "walking disorderly." We are thus obeying God, each of us, when we go our separate way, withdrawing ourselves from all the rest because they are "walking disorderly, and not after the tradition received of us." We have biblical authority for our splintered sects!

In my home town of Denton, Texas, a university city of only 25,000, the disciples are split six different ways. At this moment two new groups are trying to get started, one meeting in a bank building and the other in a lodge

hall. Both are non-instrument. When the instrumental Independents come in to cast their lot against the liberal Disciples, which we are looking for at anytime, the disciple menu will be filled.

An interesting point about one of these new groups in Denton is that their recent visiting evangelist was formerly the minister for one of the other churches in town. Since the minister left Denton a few years ago, he has cast his lot with the anti-institutional persuasion, which is the newest faction in the non-instrument wing, and which is rapidly crystallizing into what Professor DeGroot of Texas Christian University is going to have to call "Church of Christ No. 3." This evangelist, who is an able and affable man, was completely boycotted by his former associates in the main-line churches. They would not announce his meetings, and those who heard him preach in their own congregation years ago would not now so much as visit his services. He in turn believes that they are in error, and he argues that they should "come out from among" their apostasy into the loyal church. Denton is therefore a mission field with each "loyal church" seeking to persuade all the others who are "walking disorderly."

This conglomerated tragedy is something like an army marching to the front with each soldier insisting that everybody is out of step but himself, and breaking rank and "going it alone" when the others will not see it his way. The two new congregations in Denton are both small and struggling, both will spend years saving and sacrificing for buildings and preachers of their own, both insisting that such separation is justifiable on the grounds that they are walking according to the traditions of the apostles while the others are "walking disorderly."

An interesting and revealing way of looking at this tragically abused passage is in some of the modern versions.

Revised Standard: "Keep away from any brother who is living in idleness and not in accord with the tradition that you received from us."

New English: "Hold aloof from every Christian brother who falls into idle habits, and does not follow the tradition you received from us."

Barclay: "Keep yourselves from every brother who behaves like a truant from duty and who does not conduct himself in accordance with the teaching which they received from us."

Goodspeed: "Keep away from any brother who lives in idleness, instead of following the teaching you received from us."

It is important to notice that the apostle makes no reference whatever to disagreements on doctrine or to erroneous teaching. The disorder he speaks of is *walking,* that is, it has reference to the way some of them were *living,* and not to any differences of opinion that may have existed between them. Yet it can be observed that this passage is nearly always made to apply to some brother who is "out of line" on some doctrinal issue.

Paul is dealing with a problem of indolence at Thessalonica. Some of them who were downright lazy were using the second coming of Christ as an excuse for not working. They had given up their jobs and had quit the

routines of everyday life in order to await in excited idleness the Lord's coming. This caused Paul to lay down the injunction: "If a man refuses to work, neither let him eat." Paul gave them orders not to impose on each other. Whether Jesus comes soon or not, he urges that they "should quietly go on working and so eat their bread." He then explained how he himself worked in their midst so as to be a burden to no one. They were to do likewise.

Now those that refused to follow such instruction were to be avoided by the others: "Don't associate with him that he may be ashamed. Don't reckon him as an enemy, but give him advice as a brother." (verses 14-15, Barclay) There is nothing in this passage to suggest a "withdrawal of fellowship," as if this were ours to barter with as we please. To the contrary, Paul makes it clear that these brethren who are "held aloof" are still to be treated as brothers: "Give him advice as a brother"; "Don't treat him as an enemy."

The phrase "walking disorderly" means "living in idleness" (see 2 Thess. 3:11: "We hear that some of you are living in idleness, mere busybodies, not doing any work"). He started working on that problem in the first epistle when he told the Thessalonians to "admonish the idle." (1 Thess. 5:14) Paul makes no reference to exclusion from fellowship nor does he give any justification in this passage for our loveless art of drawing the line on our brethren for every conceivable thing.

2 Thess. 3:6 might apply in any case where a brother's life is not exemplary, whether he be indolent, careless about his language, or shady in his business dealings. In all such cases, I would do well to follow Paul's instructions and keep away from that kind of brother, lest he ensnare me with his questionable practices. Yet I am to keep on loving him and helping him as I may; yea, treating him *as a brother* and not an enemy.

It is possible to use the passage in this way, but to use it as a club against every brother who is different from myself is to abuse it. There are scriptures that teach that it is sometimes necessary to excommunicate brethren from the fellowship of the congregation, but 2 Thess. 3:6 is not one of them. It seems that men *want* to exclude others when they will force meanings upon passages that are not there. Surely evil days are upon us when we will use the Book that God gave to unite us as a defense for our divisions.

God's word frees us to welcome each other as Christ welcomes us. The Bible is a charter of liberty that unites men who might otherwise be alienated. Our efforts to restore unity in our own ranks will be greatly enhanced when we see the Bible as the source of that unity rather than a justification of the prevailing division.—*the Editor*

THE GOOD MAN IN ANCIENT GREEK THOUGHT

It is not easy to account for the genius of ancient Greek thought. No period of human culture has been richer in speculative boldness and penetrating insight. They had a curiosity about man and the universe that led them to an investigation of all aspects of existence, which resulted not only in a synthesis of human knowledge, but also a consideration of ethical ideals.

While civilization was thousands of years old in the cultures of Egypt and Mesopotamia by the time the Greek spirit emerged, there were several important elements lacking until the Greeks supplied them. Not only did man reach new heights in art and literature, but the inventive Greek mind also gave the world mathematics, philosophy, and science. They produced the first real historians; they were the first critics and logicians. They moved out into the world of ideas and speculated upon the great questions of life without being bound by the superstitions and superficialities that hampered other cultures.

Whatever discipline one may study or whatever aspect of human progress he may consider, the ancient Greeks come into the picture in a significant way. Whether it be physics or biology, psychology or philosophy, history or music, mathematics or astronomy, architecture or medicine the Greeks have played an important role, and usually the *primary* role. It is to be expected therefore that some of the best thinking on the nature of the good life may also be traced to Greece. They were the first to make ethics central in philosophical thought.

Though we are tempted to stand off and gape at the genius of the Greek spirit, there may be explanations for it. W. T. Jones in *History of Western Philosophy* points to the circumstance of geography as part of the reason. Greece is a peninsula that is virtually isolated, for the shores are deeply indented, the isthmus is narrow, and there are many mountains with high and precipitous walls. Communication was easier by water than by land. This kind of geography made for both political autonomy and rugged individualism. They not only had time to think, but they were also independent enough of other cultures to think—and to think for themselves. They developed a strong sense of history, and therefore of destiny, and there was intense national pride, so much so that all others were Barbarians.

Another factor was the stimulation they received from the colonies they established in the chain of islands that reached out from their shores toward Asia. These served as frontiers in other cultures, which added vigor and boldness to their individuality. The spirit of philosophical and scientific inquiry actually first appeared in these colonies, then moved to the mainland of Greece through emigration.

The easy-going, gregarian type of life that characterized much of Greece provided the leisure necessary for meditation and speculation. Above all, however, in the Greek mind was what B. A. G. Fuller calls their "disinterested

curiosity regarding the nature of the universe." Freedom from serious international disputes, both isolation and involvement, both individuality and universality, happy geographic and economic conditions—and all these the Greeks had—cannot alone account for the Greek genius. While Fuller refers to their "disinterested curiosity," Frederick Mayer speaks of them as *naturally* curious and inquisitive. It does seem that there was something about their nature that made them so ingenius, for they did so much more with what they had.

Earlier Greek Thinkers

While the curiosity and ingenuity of the Greeks appeared early, the first thinkers were far less concerned with the nature of man than with the nature of the universe. They did not at first ask questions about the good life. Their questions were more scientific, and they can be thought of as the first scientists as well as the first philosophers. Their basic question was: *Why do things happen as they do?* They were conscious of such phenomena as change, as they sought explanations for why nature behaved the way it does.

Much of the earlier Greek thinking, therefore, was an effort to explain the world process in natural terms, apart from all the presuppositions of the superstitious religions of the time. Thales, for instance, who is often referred to as the first philosopher, conceived of water as the world-stuff from which all things evolve. This may appear childish to us, but considering the handicaps and limitations under which this sixth century B. C. thinker worked, it was a most reasonable conclusion. He saw water turn to ice or to gases; he witnessed evaporation, rainfall, springs gushing from the earth, the silting-up of the rivers at their mouth. Could he have known that his own body was composed mostly of water he really would have been convinced!

There were many efforts to identify the world-stuff. Anaximander said it was *the boundless,* a kind of reservoir or bank from which issue such things as water, earth, air, fire. Anaximenes looked to air as the stuff from which all else comes, another plausible conclusion since so much of life is dependent upon the atmosphere. Heraclitus pointed to fire as the world-stuff, but he was more interested in explaining *the process of change* (How does the one become many?), and he found his answer in the swirling motions of fire. Is not fire always changing, and yet is it not always the same?

Parmenides was one of the more important of these old thinkers, for he accepted the task of explaining how the one basic stuff, whatever it is, changed into the many forms it takes in the objective world. He decided that change is an illusion. He talked about *the One* as the only reality; other than this he saw no motion and no change. Reality is both uncreated and indestructible. In Heraclitus and Parmenides we have an interesting contradiction: one insisting that all things are in a state of flux, the other that there are no changes taking place, but only illusions. Plato, who comes along a century later, seeks to harmonize these concepts by his view of two worlds, one being this illusory world of change, the other being a spiritual world of ideas that changes not.

Empedocles and Anaxagoras represent the pluralistic concept of world-stuff, for they supposed that "roots" or "seeds" lie behind all that is. Empedocles conceived of the world process as a continuous cycle of opposites, such as Love and Strife, in alternating motions of attraction and repulsion. While the only "real things" are earth, fire, air, and water, Empedocles saw Love as a kind of creator of all the other things that appear real to us. And yet Love contends with Strife for mastery of the universe, which accounts for the vicissitudes of both life and nature. He sees a god in all this ("He is only a sacred and unutterable mind flashing through the whole world with rapid thoughts."), but this god is no part of any *purposive* scheme. As for man, he is but the result of a temporary and sheerly accidental mixture of elements.

Anaxagoras saw "seeds" behind everything, and these were so shuffled by *Mind* as to give the universe the form it now has. This meant to him that everything is a portion of everything else. Flesh, for instance, is composed of bits of everything else. His view of *Mind* is hazy, for he speaks of it as that which "sets all things in order," and yet he says it is strictly a mechanical process. Anaxagoras sought answers to the question of motion, and he settled for a single circular force as the explanation for change, but in all this there was no particular concern for the nature of man.

Ancient Greece also had its atomists, who saw the universe as made up of atoms and empty space. They were baffled by the existence of a world made up of so many different things. How could so many different things come from just one stuff or even several basic stuffs? They tried to account for motion on the grounds of atoms that are eternal, solid, indestructible, and that are moved by necessity. Does not modern physics deal with a universe already in motion?

Democritus, the most important of the atomists, held some moral views in connection with his atomic theory. Man's progress depends upon scientific knowledge, he argued, and man cannot understand himself without a knowledge of the world around him. The soul of man is composed of atoms, which suggested to him that humanity is part of infinity. There can be no Maker or Creator, for the things that are have always been. There is motion that changes stuff into different forms, which is a kind of shuffling of the atoms, but all this is strictly mechanistic.

From what little we have of his writings we can construct a general description of the good Man. He is not one who relies on wealth, fame, or social position, for these things mean nothing apart from wisdom. The Good Man is a man of restraint and understanding, one who controls his desires. He emphasized the purity of motive: "The enemy is, not he that injures, but he that wants to." He elevates such virtues as the willingness to listen, carefulness, cheerfulness, and soul-care. He urged the avoidance of envy and distrust. He insisted that cheerfulness is gained through moderation, and that it is excess that damages the soul.

These thinkers of the ancient Greek period can be thought of as *cosmological* thinkers in that they were seeking to understand the ways of the universe.

After 2500 years of scientific progress their answers appear to us both trivial and superficial, but when we consider that they lived in the *pre*-scientific age when men hardly dared to think for themselves and at a time when the methods and tools of research were yet undeveloped, we can but be amazed. After all, they were able to raise some of the most serious philosophical questions: the problem of the one and the many, the nature of the relationship between Being and change, the question of time and space. We admire their curiosity and their search for truth.

They laid the foundations for conceptual thinking; they gave birth to philosophy. With them the groundwork was laid for logic, epistemology (study of knowledge), and religious philosophy. They were the first scientists, or perhaps *pre*-scientists. They planted the seed for the natural and physical sciences. Astronomy, mathematics, biology, medicine, geology, and physics were at least anticipated. They did, after all, talk about atoms—and even Mind and the Logos!

We have seen that from this period of the history of thought we learn little about who the Good Man is. Perhaps the purview of things was too mechanistic, or maybe they figured that man must first understand his environment before he could start answering the serious questions about himself. In any event, there were schools of thought that emerged that did show more awareness for the good life, and insofar as time is concerned these schools were approximate to the pre-Socratics, though they represent a different philosophical emphasis. In them we find more definitive efforts to identify the Good Man.

Pythagoreans: the Harmonious Man

The Pythagoreans were mystics who did things like preach to animals and perform miracles. Lord Russell describes Pythagoras as a combination of Einstein and Mrs. Eddy. He was a scientist that came to see order—even musical harmony—in all the universe. And he founded a religious society that endeavored to discover reality in man and the universe. If religious mysticism and science cannot stand together, then Pythagoras would have to be placed with the mystics. Like Kant, who drew inspiration from the starry heavens above and the moral law within man, Pythagoras found in an intricately ordered universe a source of intellectual admiration and religious awe.

Such a universe he describes as a *cosmos*. His formula was: "All things are number." Even space is dominated by what he called rational numbers. Everything, including the stars and human beings, are controlled by numerical ratios. To the Pythagoreans astronomy was a means of studying human existence; and music was a philosophy within itself, for all of nature is something like a musical scale. Just as one can run his finger down the strings of a violin and discover an harmonious order of sound (even from one string if he stops at the right points that are determined by certain numerical ratios), he can also find that the whole universe is a cosmos of order and beauty, yea even a grand symphony of harmony.

John Randall (*The Role of Knowledge in Western Religion*) points out that the Pythagoreans were the first to reconcile science and religion, which means an identification of the object of religious feeling and aspiration with scientific truth. To Pythagoras science was a means of stimulating concern for eternal things. He considered his own scientific conclusions as signs of heavenly inspiration. Like both Descartes and Pascal, the Pythagoreans combined scientific interests (especially mathematics) with religious devotion. They were certain that all principles could be expressed in numbers, for *number* to them was the principle of reality. This enabled them, like Spinoza, to see life under the aspect of enternity.

Their idea of the Good Man is revealed in part by the kind of secret society they founded. It was a monastic order with emphasis on vegetarianism and rigorous self-examination. It had its secret rites and initiation, and much of the teaching was allegorical. "Do not stir the fire with a knife" must have meant some such thing as *don't encourage the pride of man.* "Do not overstep the beam of a balance" is probably an injunction to be just. As for other allegorical tid-bits, such as "Do not look in a mirror beside a light," one guess is as good as another.

Both men and women were admitted to the society; property was held in common; there was a common way of life. At the close of each day they would examine each other as to how productive life had been. They believe in reincarnation and followed rites calculated to purify the soul. So they were as religious as they were scientific and philosophical. We are indebted to the Pythagorean brotherhood for the term *philosophy,* which meant to them *the love of wisdom.*

The society used music to purify the soul, and they talked about "the music of the spheres," which was a kind of revelation from God, even though human ears cannot detect it. Music was a means of strengthening morality, they believed. Warlike tunes will make one belligerent and melancholy tunes will create pessimism and fatalism; but the right kind of music will both educate the mind and improve moral and spiritual values.

The Good Man is one whose soul is in harmony with the orderly system of the universe. Wickedness is sickness caused by disintegration of purposive existence. The good life is *theoretical,* with "theory" meaning *a passionate sympathetic contemplation.* The Pythagorean was a stranger in this world, and he thought of his body as a prison of the soul, which will someday take its flight to a higher sphere. The Good Man therefore contemplates the higher values. They divided men into three classes, somewhat like they are divided at the Olympic games. The lowest class is like those who attend the games merely to buy and sell; the next are those who compete in the games. The best of all are those who come just to look on.

The best life, therefore, is the contemplative life, the philosophical life. The man who can stand off from life as a spectator, as if he were viewing things from the perspective of eternity, is the one who finds purification of soul. The perfecting of the soul is the restoration of harmony in the human

cosmos. As Cornford puts it in his *Before and after Socrates*: "The disorderly motions of passion and bodily desire need to be controlled and attuned in *Sophrosyne*—temperance, self-control, right-mindedness, wisdom."

Sophists: the Clever Man

The Sophists were the pragmatists of the ancient world. The word "Sophist" originally had no bad connotation, referring to a group of teachers that would roughly compare with today's *professor.* They were the ones who taught the young men *how to live,* or better, *how to play it smart in a competitive world.* They made their living teaching, which was unusual for the Greeks, and it left them open for criticism. They were so different from the Pythagoreans. The Sophists were neither mystical nor scientific; they were hardly even philosophical. They had no concern whatever in "the music of the spheres," but they had a great deal of interest in how to win friends and influence people—and to make money! They taught the art of rhetorical persuasion, public speaking, and political science. Even tricky logic and deceitful argumentation were sometime among their offerings. They taught young men to be clever.

Sophism reveals the cultural changes that were taking place in fifth-century Greece. After all, educators usually train the youth to acquire those values esteemed by the parents, and the Sophists were no different. The knightly virtues of courage, loyalty, honor, and moderation had long characterized Greek thought, but the new aristocracy wanted to know how to live. Facility in debate, demagogism, and oratorical skill began to displace the old virtues. It was more important to be clever than to be good. Indeed, the clever man was the Good Man.

They were a controversial group, mainly because they sought to sweep away the cobwebs of superstition and establish a new enlightenment. This was Their most significant contribution, which of course was negative. There was little of a positive nature. Their whole approach was shot through with both skepticism and relativism, and perhaps pessimism as well. They contended that the human mind is not equipped to mirror the universe. It is useless for man to attempt to describe the universe. Scientific investigation and philosophic speculation are vain pursuits. Man must give himself to practical affairs. Knowledge is unreal and even impossible except in a pragmatic way. Right and wrong depend strictly upon the whims of society.

Protagoras, the most prominent of the Sophists, is known for his statement that "Man is the measure of all things." This means that each man is his own standard, that there is no higher authority or greater principle than man himself, and when men differ there is no objective truth by which right and wrong can be determined. There is no standard of right; there is indeed no clear theory of anything. Justice is simply a matter of being clever enough to get what you want out of life, which may be achieved by means of getting others to respect my rights!

The Sophists are important to a search for the Good Man because with them the emphasis in philosophy shifted from the universe to *man.* They stimulated a great deal of thought about the nature of man, and they caused some to re-think their moral presuppositions. A healthy skepticism is imperative in the search for truth, and while the Sophists may have made skepticism an end in itself, they nonetheless caused people to think. They motivated vigorous discussion in the field of ethics. For this reason they will come into view again in our study of Socrates and Plato.

Scepticism: the Uncommited Man

Like most Greek philosophies, Scepticism sought to give men quietude and peace of mind. The good life was tranquil and serene. The Sceptics tried to achieve such a life through non-assertion. By refusing either to affirm or to deny they supposed that they could dispose of the problems troubling the human mind. They found comfort in suspending judgment. They argued that one must suffer mental anguish when he supposes that he must choose between alternatives. Virtue is the courage to remain uncommited. Mental rest comes only by refusing to affirm or deny anything.

Starting with the proposition that nothing is indisputably certain, which one presumably must concede, the Sceptics contended that no sense impression can be depended upon. Something tastes sweet or sour depending on circumstances; a straight oar looks crooked in the water; a tower may look round at a distance and square close at hand; a mountain may look very near and yet be far away; then there are mirages, hallucinations, dreams. Nothing in human experience is reliable; there can be no absolute certainty of anything; everything is relative.

Any argument that one would make regarding order or providence, the Sceptics would make a counter argument. If one argued for the design and order of the universe by pointing to the movements of heavenly bodies, they would refer to the ills and calamities of life as a sign of disorder. If one suggested that knowledge can be real because of all the progress man has made through the centuries, they would counter by pointing to the many instances when men *thought* they knew when they did not, and so *how can man be sure about what he thinks he knows now.* The Sceptics thus kept all ideas fluid and all concepts, both intellectual and moral, strictly relative.

Actually, the only way for man to be free and happy, they insisted, was to abandon the struggle to know. Their advice was for one not to bother himself. As Bevan in *Stoics and Sceptics* observes of them: "The unhappy desire to know was the cause of all the fever and the fret, the polemical passion and torturing doubt. Once grasp the fact that the desire was essentially futile, that you could let the mind play and *hold it back* all the while from fixed belief, and there was no reason that you should not be perfectly happy and contented in nescience."

That is the word for the Sceptics: *nescience.* They made a science of *not knowing,* which may itself be a contradiction. If knowledge is so uncertain, how can one be so sure that knowledge is impossible? If I know that I do not know, then there is something I know!

Perhaps we see the Good Man of Scepticism in the person of Pyrrho, the founder of the school. His followers were amazed at his self-control and serenity. He had no fear of physical pain. Once when he underwent an operation, he expressed no emotion whatever. In his teaching he stressed self-examination, like Socrates, and he too used the marketplace for a classroom. The Sceptics thought of themselves as gadflies, like Socrates again, and they too believed in rugged individualism. Pyrrho was a gadfly in that he always questioned the dogmas of his time. He believed that peace of mind comes with suspension of judgment. He taught his disciples that they should neither affirm nor deny anything. "Why this more than that?" was a basic question to Pyrrho. Virtue is found in non-assertion. The Good Man to Pyrrho is *arrepsia,* which to his Greek mind meant "equipoise"—the refusal to assent to either alternative. All views are equal in credibility and in non-credibility.

It would appear that Scepticism is a complete paralysis of action. If non-assertion and non-commitment are virtues most to be desired, then why should man ever act? Reduced to its logical conclusion, this would follow. But some Sceptics were willing to be inconsistent in order to give place for more moral action. They invented the doctrine of "action based on what is reasonable." Even though one cannot know, he can act in view of what appears to be reasonable and justifiable. The idea of "probability" became meaningful to them: if an action has a high *probability* of propriety, it is right. It is a doctrine based on common sense. While the Sceptic can never be dogmatic, he nonetheless lives the good life, based on probability and common sense, because he believes that one cannot be truly happy without virtue.

Though the Sceptics supposedly had no beliefs or values, or at least their teachings would indicate this, they did however appeal to such moral criteria as the guidance of nature, control of the passions, traditional ethics, and even instruction in the arts. This may only mean that the Sceptic's morality consists in conforming as best one can to the conventions of the day. While piety was not altogether absent in ancient Scepticism (Pyrrho was so pious that his city made him the high priest), it can hardly be said that it was friendly to religion. There is no place for God in Scepticism.

The Christian philosopher can appreciate one noble contribution of the Sceptics: *they mercilessly compelled men to think for themselves and to question every proposition.* Like Augustine, the Christian must believe that truth has nothing to fear, and that no truth is contradictory to any other truth. The believer, therefore, be he a scientist or an educator, has no reason to hesitate in moving forward into frontiers of new truth. He will be unafraid to explore new ideas or to find better ways of doing things, for he believes that any new truth he finds will harmonize with the truths he may already have.

The Christian is willing to question every proposition, and in this respect "scepticism" is a virtue. But Scepticism as a philosophy or as a way of life failed in that it purposely and deliberately tried to build a society that believed

in nothing. It is a self-contradictory approach, for to contend that knowledge is impossible is itself a proposition that cannot be established. If one says that man cannot know anything, he is saying that man *can* know something! Scepticism defeated itself in teaching that the way to happiness is the abandonment of all belief. It had to yield to the Stoic "common sense" logic that the senses are reliable and that man can know.

While the Sceptic argued, "There is nothing to believe," the Christian retorted, "But I do believe." An important difference is that the Sceptic thought only in terms of propositions, while the Christian thought in terms of a Person. When propositions may appear ever so uncertain, the magnetism of Jesus evoked the curious kind of faith that could say, "Lord, I believe, help thou my unbelief."

Scepticism is wrong because it makes doubt an end in itself. Like Philo the Jew, the Christian contends that doubt for the sake of doubting is unworthy of a philosopher. It is legitimate to use doubt in the testing of ideas or in indicating the limits of human reason, but doubt cannot serve as an end in itself. C. S. Pierce's definition of doubt is helpful in this connection: "Doubt is an uneasy and dissatisfied state from which we struggle to free ourselves and pass into the state of belief." He shows that the function of doubt is to stimulate man's thinking until the doubt is destroyed.

Unlike the Sceptic who makes doubt its own end, the Christian accepts doubt as a cause in the struggle to attain a state of belief. Pierce states that "the irritation of doubt is the only immediate motive for the struggle to attain belief." It is when doubts are created that inquiry into truth begins, and a faith that wins out over doubt may be called *conviction.* If the Christian can say "Faith without works is dead," he might say in another sense that "Faith without *doubt* is dead." At least we can say that doubt begets inquiry and inquiry begets faith. The Christian therefore has no fear of doubt, as uneasy and painful as it may be, for he uses it to enrich faith.

Cynicism: the Simple Man

Cynicism was not a philosophical system as much as a way of life. It has been described as "a short-cut to virtue," meaning that it had no concern for philosophy as a speculative discipline, but was interested only in those ideas that would produce virtue. They saw happiness as the supreme aim, and all their thinking was toward the creation of the happy way of life. This was the way of renunciation, *the simple life.* The Cynic sought to overcome all desire except the desire for goodness; purity of motive was the watchword. To be free and serene is what counts; money, politics, pleasure are irrelevant. Marriage is all right, but it is better to be unencumbered. A pleasure-seeking man can be neither happy nor free.

Success is the formation of character; the Good Man has the willpower to be what reason dictates to him. Socrates was their model man, for he cultivated the character that was true to his essential nature. Happiness is a certain attitude of mind, and Socrates had this. They were much like the Stoics whom

we shall consider later. Both the Cynics and the Stoics were harbingers for Christian ethics, chiefly because of their concern for freedom, their faith in reason, their belief in one God, and their insistence on ethical religion. Gomperz in *Greek Thinkers* speaks of the Cynics as having "an insatiable thirst for freedom, a profund sensitiveness to the ills of life, an unshakable faith in the majesty and the all-sufficiency of reason, and a corresponding abysmal contempt for all traditional ideals." Such characteristics made them tutors unto Christ.

Diogenes is one of the most famous of the Cynics, and he serves as a model of the simple life, shorn of all the ostentation that mars true happiness. He would not own a home, choosing rather to spend his days in a tub. He is the one who carried a lighted lantern day and night through the streets of Athens, looking for an honest man. The story is told that Alexander the Great, once a student of Aristotle, so admired the philosopher for his indifference to social amenities that he once rode up to him as he sat basking in the sun and offered to grant him any favor. "Only stand out of my light" was his response to the emperor.

Diogenes taught the Cynics to renounce civilization and return to simplicity. He ate the simplest foods and wore the same cloak the year round. He once saw a child drinking out of his hands and threw away his cup; he saw another child eating off the ground and threw away his plate. In the summer he would roll in the burning sand, and in the winter he would embrace frozen pillars. He swore himself to poverty. He claimed that philosophy taught him the one thing that matters most, showing him what was his and what was not his. Fame, position, wealth, and human relationships were not his, for these could be lost and are perishable. The power he could claim over his own mind was inalienably his. Wealth and poverty are not in possessions, but in the hearts of men. Philosophy gave him the power to deal with any external circumstance by way of inward discipline.

These philosophers were called Cynics, not because they were "cynical" in the modern sense of that term, but because they were like dogs (*cynos* is the Greek word for dog) in their churlishness and captiousness, and in their indifference to the niceties of life. But the Cynics did not mind being different or even odd so long as they could be free men who were indifferent to circumstance. Like Socrates, they were convinced that no harm can befall the Good Man. They admitted that sickness and pain and poverty and death do come upon the Good Man, but these are not really bad if one is good.

While they no doubt went too far in discounting social amenities and proprieties as of no value, they made a noble effort to give proper emphasis to the inner man. But in doing this they misintepreted their hero Socrates, who was so concerned with manners and customs and laws that he refused to collaborate in an act of illegality that would have saved his life.

It was Antisthenes, the founder of the sect, that exemplified for the Cynics "a dog's life." He insisted on carrying a beggar's staff, and his coarse woolen mantle was so ragged that Socrates once twitted him by saying, " I can

see your vanity through your cloak." But Antisthenes was the ideal man to the Cynics because of his disdain for the amenities of life. He was surly and independent, hardy and self-sufficient. It was his simple life that made him good. Goodness to the Cynics meant self-control, which to them meant fortifying the inner life against both the fortunes and adversities of the external world. Cultivation of the mind is the way to do this. Antisthenes wrote voluminously in an effort to nurture the mind, but his writings are not extant. He wrote so much in fact that he was referred to as a "universal chatterbox." His writings included criticisms of Plato, whom he saw as an apostle of meaningless abstractions. Plato in turn described him as a man who had the kind of eye that could see a horse, but lacked the kind of mind which could see the conception of a horse.

The Christian might well interpret the Cynic ethic as proud and self-sufficient, offering nothing greater than the crudity of an Antisthenes or a Diogenes. To the Cynic virtue was for virtue's own sake, and its end was no more than a hardy self-sufficiency. But Antisthenes and his disciples did lay some groundwork for Christian ethics. When asked about his greatest debt to philosophy, Antisthenes replied: "The ability to hold converse with myself." This rugged individualism, so characteristic of the Cynics, left its mark upon Greek culture. Gomperz sees Cynicism as "the philosophy of the proletariate," and suggests that their accent on freedom and self-assertion was favorable to Christianity. He sees their concern for world citizenship as an important step towards brotherhood.

Cyrenaics: the Man who has a Good Time

This school of Greek thought did not consider philosophy as a study of reality, but as a branch of learning which best teaches man how to enjoy himself. Unlike the Cynics, these philosophers believed it is foolish to neglect the body, for it can give us such great pleasure. Pleasure that can be enjoyed here and now is the chief end in life. They gave little attention to the idea of pleasure in a future life. The immediate pleasures of the flesh meant more to them than any "pie in the sky by and by." Bodily pleasures are vivid and intense, and are, therefore, to be preferred to intellectual pleasures.

The Stoics criticized the Cyrenaics in this regard. Cicero points out that they forgot that as a horse is made for galloping and an ox for ploughing and a dog for hunting, so man is made for understanding. But the Cyrenaic could not forget that the flesh was capable of intense and continuous pleasures, and they saw no reason why "that which is most pleasant to man" should not be the end and aim of life. They distinguished between pleasure and happiness: *pleasure* is desirable for its own sake, while *happiness* is desirable only for the pleasure which it brings. Happiness is the sum total of all the pleasures. It is therefore the particular and individual pleasures, the sensual joys, that make up the good life. Because of this view they were called Hedonists, a Greek term meaning pleasure, especially *immediate* pleasure.

Up to this point it appears that we have described nothing more than a

sensualistic way of life, one that is easily criticized and rejected. We should not forget, however, that the Cyrenaic kind of hedonism is a fair representation of the thinking of many people in our own time. How many of us really choose intellectual or spiritual pleasures over the fleshly? How many give only lip service to the higher pleasures while living like a Cyrenaic? In order to do justice to the Cyrenaics it is important that we realize that they were a better people than their beliefs indicate. This is often true of people. Many rise above the narrowness, bigotry, or sensuality of the religious or political sect to which they belong. It can be said that to some extent the Cyrenaics talked one way but lived another. At least this was true of their founder Aristippus.

It is surprising that the founder of this pleasure-loving sect would be a devoted disciple of Socrates. Tradition has it that Aristippus got so excited over Socrates' teaching that he fainted. He was at one time within the master's inner circle. So close was he to Socrates that Plato explains that he was not present when Socrates died. His views of pleasure being what they were, it was afterwards said of him, by way of personal attack, that he was not with Socrates when he died because he was out carousing with some woman. History records other such criticisms of him: his life was consistent with his theory of pleasure; he lived like the most debauched of men; one who studied at his school would leave a profligate.

But Aristippus was not all that bad. To the contrary, it appears that he lived so as to gain the respect of most men. Cicero, for instance, who often criticized his doctrine, referred to him and Socrates as having "great and superhuman virtues" that the ordinary man cannot imitate. Even though he talked as if he loved money, luxury, prostitutes, and flattery, he did not seem really to value such things. While pleasure is good, it is mastery over pleasure that counts. His famous epigram is, "I possess but I am not possessed." He was once given the choice of three prostitutes. Not wanting to choose, he took all three of them home with him, and then dismissed them when he reached the door. Plato referred to this indifference when he said of Aristippus, "You alone are endowed with the gift to flaunt in robes or go in rags." No man enjoyed luxury more, but none valued it less.

Above all else Aristippus can be respected for his gift of sympathy and the sweetness of his disposition. He never quarrelled, and he shows us how to react when maligned. He once walked away from one who was attacking him with foul language. "Why do you run away?" demanded the attacker. "Because, as it is your privilege to use foul language, it is mine not to listen," he replied. On another such occasion he said, "You may be the master of the wrong way to speak, but I am the master of the right way to listen." His greatest debt to philosophy he described as "the ability to feel at ease in any company." William Barclay in his study of the Cyrenaics in *The Expository Times* says that the most characteristic thing Aristippus ever said was that "the most wonderful sight in life is the sight of a kind and good man walking in the midst of wicked men, and never deflected from his path." Barclay comments

that he doubtless meant it for Socrates, but that it fits Aristippus himself just as well.

The philosophical basis for the Cyrenaic hedonism was in their theory of knowledge. Nothing can be known with certainty, for our senses are tricky and will deceive us. People see the same things in different ways: the man with jaundice will see everything yellow; the man with ophthalmia will see everything red. Push your eyes sideways and you will see double. Everything is relative to the individual. There is no such thing as a common feeling, Individual sensation is, therefore, the standard of everything. Nothing is really just or honorable, for there is no standard for such virtues. Convention and tradition are the only criteria. They denied the existence of any gods and viewed religion as superstition.

They held pleasure to be good no matter whence it comes, for one's sensation is the only judge. So no pleasure is bad in itself. In fact pleasure is the only thing that is good in itself. It is the end while all else is the means. They esteemed prudence as a virtue, for the prudent man knows best how to attain pleasures. Ethics, therefore, becomes a matter of making the right choices in terms of the enjoyment of pleasure. Education is also very important in Cyrenaic thought, for only the wise man knows how to enjoy life.

A satisfactory criticism of this kind of hedonism calls for a definition of pleasure. There is that view which may be described as *Christian* hedonism, which would not only identify pleasure with happiness, which the Cyrenaics would not do, but would also distinguish between lower and higher pleasures. The Christian can concede that pleasure is the supreme end in life if pleasure is given a spiritual meaning. Communion with God should be the highest of all pleasures and could well be regarded as life's supreme end. Everything that a Christian does should be for the purpose of bringing the greatest amount of happiness to the greatest number of people.

Unlike the Cyrenaics, the Christian moralist will emphasize the *quality* of pleasure rather than its *quantity,* and the *enduring* pleasures over the *fleeting* ones. The Christian will deny himself of some (or too much of) sensual pleasures in order to enjoy spiritual ones, and he will choose the more enduring joys of the soul rather than the passing pleasures of the flesh.

The Christian may agree with the Cyrenaics that pleasure is in itself good, but he will insist that certain principles must be honored in the quest for pleasure. If one gains pleasure by means of doing another an injustice, he has done wrong, even though the pleasure itself may be good. The Christian may even say that any pleasant sensation within itself is good, whether it be the happy sensation caused by narcotics or the thrill of wine, women and song. But the *means* employed may be very wrong, the pleasure therefore being undeserved and unpraiseworthy, even if intrinsically good. The thrill of sex, for example is a God-given good, and is still a good even when made possible by the body of a prostitute. It is the *means* that is wrong. There are God-given *means* to the God-given good. It is *good* to give money to the poor, but *wrong* to steal the money in order to do it.—THE EDITOR

UNUSUAL GATHERING IN DALLAS

Wynnewood Christian Chapel, 2303 S. Tyler, Dallas, Texas will be the location for one of the most unique gatherings in the history of the disciples in Texas. The dates are June 30 through July 5.

It is different in that it will be a gathering of brethren from many parts of the Church of Church-Christian Church brotherhood. Several of the Church of Christ groups, including premillennial, non-Sunday School, one-cup, both anti and pro Herald of Truth persuasions, will be represented, and both the liberal and conservative wings of the Christian Church. Let this be considered an invitation to all brethren of the Restoration Movement to attend and take part.

Another unique feature is that everyone who desires can share in the discussions as long as time permits. The meetings will not only be free and open, but they will be orderly and peaceful. The over-riding principle of the forum is "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God."

It seldom happens among us that we can sit down together as brethren and discuss ways of peace without rancor. At this forum brethren will be together who previously have hardly felt free even to acknowledge each other as brother. We anticipate a glorious, Christ-centered gathering.

Some of the subjects to be discussed are: *What is the Unity We Seek?, The Nature of Christian Fellowship, Premillennial Churches and their Concern for Unity, Who is my Brother?, Unity of the Saints and the Problem of Institutionalism, The Holy Spirit and the Fellowship of the Saints, Neglected Factors in Our Efforts to Achieve Oneness, Agape and the Problem of Division.*

Speakers and panelists include Carl Ketcherside, Editor of *Mission Messenger,* St. Louis, Mo.; Carl Spain, Professor at Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas; Robert Meyers, Professor at Friends University, Wichita, Kan.; Leroy Garrett, Professor at Texas Women's University, Denton, Texas; Bryan Vinson. Evangelist of Church of Christ, Longview, Texas; Jack Holt, Minister of Forest Lane Church of Christ, Dallas, Texas; Carroll Wrinkle, Building Contractor, Tyler, Texas. Dr. Horace Wood, Dentist, Dallas, Texas; Darrell Bolin, Evangelist, Lock Haven, Pa.

As this goes to press the above list is not complete. There will be others. Please understand, however, that *anyone* present will have opportunity to share in the exchange of ideas, irrespective of his doctrinal point of view. The program is arranged with such dialogue in mind.

Sessions are at 6 p.m. June 30; 2 p.m. and 7 p.m. July 1 and 2; and 9:30 a.m., 2 p.m. and 7 p.m. on July 3, 4, and 5. A very cordial invitation is extended to all.